ne * · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/964,930	JAMES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John Kreck	3673
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>John Kreck</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Melissa Hayworth</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 24 May 2004	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicate ☐ Applicate ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I. Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 22-29,32	•	
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate in directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate in did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar 	e examiner will provide a writter record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
•		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	/Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted applicant's representative to discuss the reply filed 4/22/04. Examiner indicated that the rejection to claims 22-29 and 32 would be maintained in a final rejection. Examiner indicated that applicant's arguments against the inherent physical properties of the cited prior art were not timely, in that applicant failed to traverse this aspect of the rejection when it was first raised, and not persuasive since applicant failed to provide any supporting evidence. Examiner suggested canceling claims 22-29 and 32.